1 2	CHARLES B. WALKER Executive Director City of San Diego Ethics Commission		
3	1010 Second Avenue, Suite 1530, San Diego, CA 92101 (619) 533-3476		
4	Complainant		
5			
6			
7			
8	BEFORE THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO		
9	ETHICS COMMISSION		
10	In the Matter of	Case No. C02-67	
11	Michael Madigan,	STIPULATION, DECISION AND ORDER	
12	Respondent.		
13			
14	THE PARTIES STIPULATE AS FOLLOWS:		
15	1. Complainant Charles B. Walker is the Executive Director of the City of San		
16	Diego Ethics Commission [Ethics Commission]. The Ethics Commission is charged with a duty		
17	to administer, implement, and enforce local governmental ethics laws contained in the San Diego		
18	Municipal Code [SDMC] relating to, among other things, the disclosure of economic interests		
19	as set forth in the City's Ethics Ordinance.		
20	2. Respondent Michael Madigan [Respondent] was, at all times mentioned herein, a		
21	consultant retained by the City of San Diego for the ballpark and redevelopment project.		
22	Respondent was required to file statements of economic interests pursuant to the conflict of		
23	interest code adopted by the City Council for the Office of the City Manager.		
24	3. This Stipulation, Decision and Order [Stipulation] will be submitted for consideration by		
25	the Ethics Commission at its next scheduled meeting, and the agreements contained herein are		
26	contingent upon the approval of the Stipulation and the accompanying Decision and Order by the		
27	Ethics Commission.		
28	///	1	
	STIPULATION, DECISION AND ORDER OF THE SAN DIEGO ETHICS COMMISSION		

28 ///

- 4. This Stipulation resolves all factual and legal issues raised in this matter by the Ethics Commission without the necessity of holding an administrative hearing to determine the Respondent's liability.
- 5. Respondent understands and knowingly and voluntarily waives any and all procedural rights under the SDMC, including, but not limited to, a determination of probable cause, the issuance and receipt of an administrative complaint, the right to appear personally in any administrative hearing held in this matter, the right to confront and cross-examine witnesses testifying at the hearing, the right to subpoena witnesses to testify at the hearing, and the right to have the Ethics Commission or an impartial hearing officer hear this matter.
- 6. The Respondent acknowledges that this Stipulation is not binding upon any other law enforcement or government agency and does not preclude the Ethics Commission from referring this matter to, cooperating with, or assisting any other law enforcement or government agency with regard to this or any other related matter.
- 7. The parties agree that in the event the Ethics Commission refuses to accept this Stipulation, it shall become null and void. Respondent further agrees that in the event the Ethics Commission rejects the Stipulation and a full evidentiary hearing before the City Ethics Commission becomes necessary, no member of the Ethics Commission or its staff shall be disqualified because of prior consideration of this Stipulation.

SUMMARY OF FACTS

- 8. On March 22, 2000, Respondent filed an assuming office statement of economic interests. Respondent filed an amendment to this statement on March 30, 2000.
- 9. On March 16, 2001, Respondent filed an annual statement of economic interests for the 2000 calendar year.
- 10. On October 7, 2001, Respondent married Laurie McKinley, a principal of McKinley Nielsen Associates, Inc. dba MNA Consulting. At all times mentioned herein, Ms. McKinley had an ownership interest in MNA Consulting that was greater than ten percent and valued at more than \$2,000. MNA Consulting is located in and does business in the City of San Diego.

28

///

COUNTS 1 AND 2 1 Violation of SDMC Section 27.3510 2 [Disclosure of Interest in Business Entity] 3 17. Respondent failed to report his spouse's interest in MNA Consulting on Schedule A-2 of 4 his annual statement of economic interests for the 2001 calendar year, as well as his leaving 5 office statement. COUNTS 3 THROUGH 6 6 Violation of SDMC Section 27.3510 [Disclosure of Interest in Real Property] 7 8 18. Respondent failed to report his interest in the real property located at 3010 Curlew Street 9 in the City of San Diego on Schedule B of his assuming office statement, his annual statement 10 for 2001, his annual statement for 2002, and his leaving office statement. STIPULATIONS AND ORDER 11 **AGREEMENT** 12 13 19. With respect to the disclosure of his spouse's interest in MNA Consulting, Respondent 14 agrees to file all appropriate amendments to his annual statement of economic interests for the 15 2001 calendar year, as well as his leaving office statement. 16 20. With respect to the disclosure of his interest in the real property located at 3010 Curlew 17 Street, Respondent agrees to file all appropriate amendments to his assuming office statement, 18 his annual statement for 2001, his annual statement for 2002, and his leaving office statement. 19 **FACTORS IN AGGRAVATION** 20 21. Respondent is a sophisticated businessman with extensive experience in municipal 21 affairs. Respondent could have been more diligent in determining the scope of his disclosure 22 obligations, especially in light of the fact that he knew his spouse's company was representing 23 the San Diego Padres Baseball Club and Centre City Development Corporation with respect to 24 the ballpark and redevelopment project. 25 **FACTORS IN MITIGATION** 26 22. Respondent has cooperated fully with Ethics Commission staff in assisting with the 27 investigation. Respondent had reason to believe that his spouse's business interests were beyond 28 the scope of his required disclosure because, as of the date of their marriage, his spouse had

STIPULATION, DECISION AND ORDER OF THE SAN DIEGO ETHICS COMMISSION

1	ceased working with MNA Consulting clients located in the City of San Diego. He also provided	
2	evidence of a premarital agreement showing that the ownership interest in MNA Consulting	
3	represented his spouse's separate property. While Respondent was mistaken with regard to his	
4	obligation to disclose certain financial interests, the investigation uncovered no evidence	
5	suggesting that his failure to disclose was part of a deliberate effort to hide his economic	
6	interests. For example, while Respondent failed to disclose his ownership of the Curlew Street	
7	property, he did disclose the loan he obtained to finance the purchase of that property.	
8	CONCLUSION	
9	23. Respondent shall pay the amount of \$1,000 no later than February 28, 2003.	
10	24. This Stipulation shall not become effective until Respondent has provided to the Ethics	
11	Commission a check or money order in the amount of \$1,000 made payable to the City	
12	Treasurer.	
13		
14	DATED:	
15	CHARLES B. WALKER, Executive Director EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR ETHICS COMMISSION Complainant	
16	•	
17	DATED: MICHAEL MADIGAN, Respondent	
18		
19		
20	DECISION AND ORDER	
21	The Ethics Commission has considered the above Stipulation at its meeting on February 27,	
22	2003. The Ethics Commission hereby approves the Stipulation and orders that, in accordance	
23	with the Stipulation, Respondent pay the amount of \$1,000.	
24		
25	DATED: DOROTHY LEONARD, Chair	
26	SAN DIEGO ETHICS COMMISSION	
27		
28	5	

STIPULATION, DECISION AND ORDER OF THE SAN DIEGO ETHICS COMMISSION